

# **LWG Technical FS Meeting**

INTERNAL / CONFIDENTIAL

March 12, 2015

Meeting Notes

09:00 Participants joining the meeting

Carl, Stivers,, Todd Slater, Amy Legare, Karl Gustafson, Sean Sheldrake, Mark Lewis, Tom Gainer, Eric Blischke, Steve Ells, Kristine Koch, Elizabeth Allen, Anne Christopher, Kristin Callahan, Amanda Shellenberger, Rita Cabral, Todd King, David Livermore, Bob Wyatt, Silvina Fonseca, Scott Coffey

09:06 Meeting kicks off

Carl opens meeting with purpose: To discuss the D/F RALs and the latest information presented by EPA on the packet sent Tuesday March 10<sup>th</sup>.

Carl: Asks EPA to open the discussion and to explain the process on how the RALs were developed.

EPA: We're here to address questions, but it's up to LWG to ask specific questions about the process and decisions conveyed.

Carl: Understands the EPA is making decisions on RALs. Recognizes that the RALs are grouped for the D/F congeners. Hoping EPA would describe the thinking that occurred since the last meeting on February 24<sup>th</sup>.

EPA: Describes the reason for retaining the 3 D/F congeners due to the fact that they are not co-located with other contaminants and data density limitations.

Carl: Questioning why the 5 samples was the qualifier, or what tools were being used to determine what RALs were the right ones to pick. EPA: We focused on selecting the RALs based on percent reduction, looked at non-detects above the RAL and then grouped the RALs based on the number of non-detect samples there were to support the RAL concentration.

Karl: It's an offshoot of what was discussed and recommended by LWG. To stay true to the data and look at the available data that supported the footprints.

Carl: I now understand and agree with keeping the RAL values for the lower ranges of concentrations for the D/F congeners.

Carl: Are the maps consistent with the acreage provided in the table? Has EPA looked at the added acreage due to the new RALs? Todd: Yes, we've looked at this. Carl: Is there a percent increase that EPA has. EPA: Is there a point to this question? Carl: Just looking at how much these RALs added in terms of acreage. EPA: It does increase the acreage, but after refinement was performed to remove the areas extrapolated of larger non-detects sample point, the additional area was reduced in size considerably. Todd: It's roughly showing less than 10% of the existing areas.

Carl: What was the use of the sample points on the map? Todd: It was used qualitatively to help evaluate where the data points existed for visual interpretation of the data density.

Carl: How will EPA take the RALs and create the SMAs. I noted that PeCDD within RM9W there is area as an artifact of the natural neighbor interpolation. Are you going to hand edit them? EPA: No, it should be balanced out by artifacts in the opposite direction. The refinement needs to occur with additional sampling in the pre-design phase. Making judgment calls now presents a potential bias. The data density issues go both ways (showing areas of contamination where it may not exist and not showing areas where contamination may exist).

Bob: It will be good to document this. EPA: It will be captured in the explanation of the FS level. This isn't meant to draw lines in the sand.

Sean: The proposed plan is a good platform to characterize the data set, it's applicability for the FS and limitations for pre-design/design.

Todd Slater (LSS): Based on the dots I see, it looks like the analysis is missing the EECA data. EPA: The data we're using that is shown was what was incorporated into the FS database by LWG. It is likely that EECA data isn't surface data, or not characterized as such in the FS database.

Carl: We provided back an updated database on the additional of EECA samples. It is appearing to Todd Slater that the database isn't complete and doesn't match up with the dots on this map. If that is the case then there may be a need to go back and re-evaluate the RAL footprints.

Amanda: Are there some rules for the interpolation process for making the footprints? E.g. There are two green dots in RM6, but no green blob. EPA: No post processing was performed.

Amanda: Can you provide the GIS footprints for the interpolated footprints? Todd: Yes, if approved by client.

Carl: Amanda will send a request for the data to Todd and Cc EPA – Kristine, Sean.

Carl: Are these final? There is conflicting statements on the maps (caveats) compared to the email which EPA indicates are final and moving on.

EPA: I haven't heard anything today that would change our path forward. The reason for the caveats is that the evaluation continues as the alternatives get developed. There may be a need to modify as we go through the FS evaluation.

Carl: That's a helpful explanation. Any opportunity to see a written rationale in the near future?

EPA: When you get Section 3. Carl: Is that May timeframe? EPA: Yes.

Bob: Reiterates the 2 Action items:

1. EPA to provide the footprints for the RALs
2. LWG to confirm all of the EECA data is included in the FS database. If any is missing, LWG is to highlight what data points those are.

Todd: Perceived missing data may have to do with the fact that these are just surface data which is defined by the FS database (generally top 30, possibly 40 cm). That may be why they are not showing up.

10:00 Meeting adjourns